

DATE: February 13, 2012

RE: Developer Stakeholder Comments on the Proposed Beauregard Small Area Plan
Working Draft 1/23/12

On behalf of the developer stakeholders (JBG, Duke Realty, Hekemian, Southern Towers, and Home Properties), please accept the following comments regarding the 1/23/12 Working Draft of the Beauregard Small Area Plan:

- Page 22—With regard to neighborhood streets, given that the sites have not been fully engineered, the Plan language should encourage 14 feet sidewalks/streetscape while allowing for some areas with less than 14 feet, especially in those areas with existing site constraints.
- Page 24—More clarification/discussion is required regarding block size, including what constitutes a block and how blocks may be broken down. Details regarding how to break down block sizes through architecture, pedestrian passages and building breaks should be defined in the Design Guidelines.
- Page 29—Additional details should be provided through the development of the Design Guidelines to clarify what is meant by "architecturally significant facades require the highest level of design excellence, materials, and the innovative use of materials."
- Page 33—Recommendation 3.28 should be revised to clarify that "all existing above-grade utilities *within or along the frontages of redevelopment sites* and new utilities will be located below-grade as part of the redevelopment."
- Page 43—figure 27C -The location of the required retail on the Uplands Neighborhood should be limited to the corners of Beauregard and the new cross street. The location of the required retail in the Southern Towers Neighborhood should be limited to the proposed grocery store block at the northwest corner of Beauregard and the new cross street.
- Page 45—There are three retail areas in the proposed Small Area Plan. A retail strategy should be developed for each individual retail area, not the overall Plan area.
- Page 46—Need to add urban lofts/stacked townhouses to the building types/height information. The urban lofts will range from 45 feet to 55 feet in height.
- Page 49-51—Delete the requirement for below-grade parking and permit above-grade parking so long as it is screened by active uses/architectural treatment and so long as the

parking is not visible above the building. Delete the exhibit on Page 50 as it is not possible to know how parking will be designed at the Small Area Plan level. Parking details should be evaluated through the DSUP process, when the individual buildings are designed.

- Page 52—The office parking ratios should be increased to 2.8 per 1,000 square feet in Phase I and 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet in Phase II.
- Page 62—Revise the definition of open space in Adams Neighborhood to clarify "the Plan recommends the provision of an open space that can also be used by the public."
- Page 66—Delete the sentence that states, "The Plan recommends a canopy coverage requirement of 40 percent for each neighborhood, which can be met through a combination of on-site and/or off-site improvements." The developer stakeholders agree to meet the existing City canopy coverage requirement of 25 percent. In addition, the developer stakeholders are providing \$3,000,000.00 to the City for enhanced landscaping and streetscape improvements, as well as \$8,150,500.00 for athletic fields/recreation enhancements. To the extent that staff plans to spend additional dollars on enhancing the tree canopy within the Beauregard area, that is to occur through the proposed developer contributions.
- Page 66—A Neighborhood Open Space Plan should be provided for each neighborhood containing more than one major public open space.
- Page 68-69—Please clarify that hotels are proposed in the Adams and in Southern Towers Neighborhoods.
- Page 71—Revise Recommendation 4.29 to delete "a minimum of one tot-lot will be provided within each neighborhood." A tot-lot may not be desirable or appropriate in each neighborhood and should be considered as part of the development review process, not dictated by the Small Area Plan.
- Page 71—Need further discussion of Recommendation 4.30 regarding the permissible location for the dog park.
- Page 72—Revise the second sentence of Recommendation 4.37 to read "The location, amount and types of programming should be identified and approved as part of the development special use permit process." Given that the development will occur over 30 years, it is not possible to provide this information as part of an overall programming plan.

- Page 72—Revise Recommendation 4.46 to delete the requirement of the provision of a separate retail marketing study for optional retail. The purpose of identifying the retail as optional is so that it can be provided if the market dictates.
- Chapter 6—While the chapter discusses a number of sustainable technologies and innovative design solutions, it needs to clearly state that the applicant will be subject to the City's Green Building Policy in effect at the time of the development special use permit. In addition, the chapter should encourage innovative technologies through the provision of stormwater management/BMP credits to incentivize use of these technologies.
- Page 95—Delete the requirement of a sustainability plan for the overall plan area. Each development will be required to meet the City's Green Building Policy in effect at the time of such development.
- Page 108—To the extent that a community facilities plan is needed, it should be prepared by the City. The fire station has been identified as a desired community facility. To the extent that additional community facilities are desired, the City will need to discuss with the applicant through the DSUP process.
- Page 128-129—The Plan should not dictate market rate and/or unbundled parking. Each development should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis through the development special use permit process. In addition, parking garages with shared parking technologies are not practical or desirable everywhere and should only be discussed, if anywhere, in shared parking summaries.